 2 3 4 	SCOTT A. SUGARMAN (No. 68277) SUGARMAN & CANNON 44 Montgomery St., Suite 2080 San Francisco, CA. 94104 Telephone: (415) 362-6252 Facsimile: (415) 677-9445			
5	Attorneys for Defendant SEMYON NEYS			
6				
7	IN THE LIMITED ST	ATEC DICT	DICT COLIDT	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10 11				
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CR 05-0491 VRW CR 06-0793 VRW	
	Plaintiff,)	CR 00 0775 VRVI	
13	v.)		
14	SEMYON NEYS,	ĺ	DATE: August 28, 2007	
15	Defendant.)	TIME: 10:30 a.m.	
116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227	DEFENDANT SEMYON NEYS (REPORT AND SENTENCING METERORY	ernment age gents though he used, bourders for his alls, several ing some drivers.	ants in the fall of 2004 to report that at they may have stumbled into a large aght and sold small quantities of club cellular telephone. facts became clear. ug organization. To the contrary, it was	
28				

Defendant Semyon Neys' Sentencing Memorandum

himself). Rather, Sam bought drugs from a variety of individuals for personal use and re-sale to friends and acquaintances.

Even the individuals who sold to Sam were not significant "players." The government's investigation identified five individuals who sold either ecstasy or methamphetamine to Sam Neys – Uriel Sotomayor, Jason Tang, Anthony Nguyen, Ilya Tuchinsky and Chris Calder, and one individual – Paul Ancajima – who sold to drugs to Calder (who in turn sometimes sold to Sam). All of those individuals were charged in the indictment in CR. 05-0491 VRW, and this Court has accepted pleas from all and sentenced all but Mr. Tang. Most were simply very young individuals, who made foolish choices, who pose no real threat to the community or public safety. This Court has sentenced them accordingly (a matter further address below).

Second, the informants who first came to the agents were found to be unreliable and not trustworthy (even if their own prior and ongoing criminal activities were not counted). They continued to engage in drug activities of their own. It appears that their allegations were largely an effort to get themselves out of trouble when each was arrested for other crimes.

Third, from the statements made by Sam on the telephone and from listening to his voice, it was clear that Sam was using these drugs regularly. He was often using and under the influence of drugs and spent most of his money to that end. It is telling that when Sam was arrested and all his possessions searched, he had no substantial assets in any form – indeed, hardly assets at all.

Then why was so much attention focused on Sam Neys? Simple, the agents placed the wiretap on his cellular telephone based on the exaggerated claims of two informants who even the agents later dismissed as untrustworthy and duplicitous. The agents overheard all of Sam's conversations, and thus Sam was the center of the data they gathered. However, if the agents had eavesdropped on others named in the Indictment, especially those the government itself has identified as individuals who sold drugs to Sam Neys, it is certainly true that each of them would have looked to be the "most" significant. Yet, in truth, all of these defendants, including Sam -- as the government has admitted and the PSR recommends -- were "minor" players.

WHO IS SAM NEYS?

Further, while government agents overhead thousands and thousands of conversations over several months involving Sam Neys, the number of actual drug sales or purchases was relatively small. Almost all were charged in the Indictment. While Sam and others "talked" like big shots, little was accomplished other than talking.

As noted above, this Court has sentenced all but one of the codefendants who the government charged with selling drugs to Sam Neys (and who admitted doing so in their plea agreements) – he was the purchaser and user, not vice-versa. According to the summary at the outset of the PSR, this Court imposed the following sentences on those individuals:

- Mr. Ancajima (a supplier to Mr. Calder, who sold to Sam): 22 months prison;
- Mr. Calder: 24 months prison;
- Mr. Sotomayor: probation with 15 months community confinement;
- Mr. Tuchinsky: 24 months (with drug program recommended); and
- Mr. Nguyen: probation with 1 year community confinement

Each was sentenced in light of his distinct personal circumstances. Still, the fact that in each and every case this Court concluded that not more than two years in prison was sufficient punishment for the individuals who sold to Sam Neys the very drugs he was accused of using and re-selling to others provides important guidance in sentencing Sam Neys.

The PSR accurately summarizes Sam's short life prior to his incarceration in this case. He as born in Latvia to a Jewish family, who became refugees when he was just a boy. Though he became a stranger in a land very different from Riga, Latvia, Sam learned quickly and did well in school. His parents labored long hours to provide for their family, and Sam was their pride and joy. However, as he reached in his mid-teen years, he became involved with some other teenagers for whom drugs and "playing" were the dominant theme. Sam, unwisely, followed their lead. PSR para. 44-48, 52-54.

This portion of the PSR was understandably brief. A better way for this Court to see Sam Neys this is a young man very much worth a second chance is to consider the very expressive letters by friends and family attached to this Memorandum. Exhibit A. The authors describe a young man of good character and considerable achievement, personal and academic, and clearly still a young man of promise. They beseech this Court to act leniently in sentencing him.

The attached letters of reference – nearly 25 in all -- offer compelling insights into the young man this Court will sentence. The authors include men and women who have known Sam and his family all his life or have known Sam over the critical few years when his life took a dramatic turn for the worse. This is the story they tell:

Sam and his family grew up in Lativa, then a part of the Soviet Union. As Jews, their lot was not easy, and the Soviet Union did not practice or protect religious freedom. His parents were hard-working people, devoted to their family and especially their only child, Sam. He was raised in a strict but loving household, learning the virtues of devotion to family, hard-work and commitment to community.

Sam and his parents came to this country when he was a boy, seeking a better life and freedom from the harshness – religious and otherwise – of then-crumbling Soviet government and system. All the writers talk of Sam as a hard-working, loving child, who was supportive of others and in turn supported by them. He was a committed member of his faith, becoming a Bar Mitzvah on his 13th birthday. He did very well in school, earning himself a place in Lowell High School, a school with – as many noted – an outstanding reputation, but also very demanding standards. He excelled in tennis, offering to teach others the skills he learned and practiced on the tennis court (see e.g., Yelena Frid). As his long-time friend Simon Shuster wrote, as a young man Sam "had every charm and talent one can hope for in a kid. He was ambitious, clever, athletic and had the social grace to make a veritable fan club of the matchmaking moms in our neighborhood."

Over and over again, the writers commented how caring and thoughtful Sam was to them or someone they knew (e.g., Veronica Golduber). They remarked on his quick intelligence, his

love of family, his good nature. Some commented on his willingness to defend and protect others who were weaker or more vulnerable (e.g., Mira Abramovich). And, for those reasons, because he was seemingly such a good and successful child, then a young man, none thought he could run afoul of their social standards, much less the law.

As high school progressed, Sam declined. He began using drugs, as an earlier generation of kids tried alcohol and later, marijuana. However, he became more and more deeply immersed in the drug culture, using more and different drugs. His grades fell and he became an intermittent stranger to his parents and to his friends. As Simon Shuster noted,

I suddenly found a stranger and a sham. On occasion I would come by his house, but it was always hard. He seemed awkward, nervous around me, as if hiding a deep shame in himself, or doing a bad, twitchy impersonation of the Sam I had known. He did reckless things, lied to me about the drugs and became completely unreliable.

(Yelena Frid made similar observations.) Maybe because all seemed so well for him, or because he hid his changed course so well, his family and friends all seemed genuinely startled by his drug addiction and descent into drug dealing.

Sam did finish Lowell, but found himself going to City College as other friends left for Stanford and colleges farther away. He worked to support himself. But he remained deeply into using drugs. As Sam told the Probation Officer, he used methamphetamine "like coffee." Para. 52.

Home life was taking a bad turn. His parents – the bedrock of most children's development – were struggling in their relationship and, while Sam was in his late teens, separated and then divorced. Several writers opined that the pain and depression Sam felt over the disintegration of his parents' marriage further served to spur his use and dependence on drugs. E.g., Yelena Frid. That is a too-common story, and surely played a role in Sam's decline. As Sam's friend Alan Khalfin poignantly wrote, "it was like watching a friend disappear even though, physically, he was still present. . . After a few months, Sam was virtually unrecognizable to me as he became completely controlled by methamphetamine and immersed in the drug lifestyle."

His mother, Mari Neys, in her letter to this Court summarized the accumulating events that may have overwhelmed a young man who, though his parents may have been unaware, was sinking into the drug culture:

As Sam was struggling with the daunting task of both working full time and taking a heavy course load at City College, my husband, Leo, and I got separated, and shortly after, divorced. This was a very difficult and overwhelming time for Sam – dealing with work, school, my divorce from his father, and out family's recent health problems, including my back injury, his grandmother's diabetes and Alzheimer's disease, and his grandfather's blood disease. Our small family had always been very closely knit, and it seemed as though it was beginning to unravel, making it hard for Sam to adjust to the recent and dramatic changes in his life.

His father, Leo Neys, expressed a similar opinion in his own letter to this Court.

The writers are consistent in two observations about Sam: first that he was a boy of promise, with a strong mind and gentle heart, and second, that since his incarceration, each has seen a striking transformation in Sam. They experienced in his letters and in their conversations and meetings, an acknowledgment that he made one bad choice after another, choices for which he is truly sorry. More importantly, many wrote that each had again seen the inquisitive young man that was lost five or so years ago and who now wants a second chance. E.g., Mari Neys, Leonid Neys, Rima Abramovich. As his friend Alan Khalfin wrote, "Sam sincerely and whole-heartedly understands that his actions were wrong and they were detrimental to himself, his family and to society."

Beyond their words, the very existence of these authors is a powerful argument for moderation in penalty. Sam has disappointed many who cared for him, who respected him. They see, and have reported to this Court, a re-birth and renewal in Sam that gives them great hope, that inspires them to write to this Court. They will be, in a real sense, his guardians – they want to see him succeed and will be wary of secrecy and strange, new friends in ways they were not when he was younger. They provide a supportive and corrective network that will help Sam strive toward the goals they all believe he is capable of achieving. They will be, in effect, community custodians of his good behavior.

 Some, like Rabbi Katz, wrote that they have worked with Sam while he has been at FDC Dublin and watched his behavior. Rabbi Katz noted Sam's commitment to improve not only his own behavior but that Sam worked to teach and educate other inmates. Rabbi Katz expressly wrote that he believed that in light of the changes and acceptance of responsibility that he saw in Sam, this Court need not impose a lengthy sentence to deter future criminal acts. Sam "was serious about changing his life and trying to become a better person."

Almost without exception, these men and women who have known Sam in good and bad times asked this Court to exercise leniency, the Shakespearean quality-of-mercy, in deciding the fair punishment for Sam, who has now been in custody for nearly 26 months. They begged this Court for leniency in sentencing Sam.

THE DECISION BEFORE THIS COURT

Sam Neys comes before this Court having served <u>more</u> time in custody than the prison sentence imposed by this Court on any of his codefendants, including five individuals who either sold drugs to him or who sold drugs to one of the individuals who sold drugs to him (Calder, Ancajima, Nguyen, Sotomayor, Tuchinsky).

The Sentencing Guideline range set forth in the PSR is driven in large part by the particularly punitive sentences for methamphetamine crimes. That is, the Guideline range for Sam Neys is so high because he was accused of selling, possessing or attempting to purchase not only ecstasy, but methamphetamine at the several points detailed in the Indictment. Most of Sam's heightened Guideline range is the result of his attempt to purchase methamphetamine from Mr. Sotomayor in the spring of 2005. By monitoring Sam's cell phone calls, the agents were in fact able to seize the package before it got to Sam.

¹ In fact, it is apparent from the PSR calculations, para. 18, that over <u>85 percent</u> of the drug weights that are used to calculate Sam's base offense level are derived from that single attempt by Mr. Sotomayor to sell methamphetamine to Sam Neys. That is, of the total drug weight of 10,272.2 kg of marijuana (the amount of ecstasy and methamphetamine were converted to amounts of marijuana), 8,804 kg were attributable to this single transaction.

This Court has placed Mr. Sotomayor on probation and ordered him to serve 15 months in community confinement. None of the other individuals in the Indictment who the government agreed sold drugs to Sam, and who admitted doing so, was sentenced to more than two years in prison. Hence, there is a compelling equity in not imposing any additional sentence on Sam Neys beyond the 26 months he has already served in prison.

Counsel understands that some of these codefendants had shown good progress while out of custody as these charges were pending. Those individuals held a steady job and/or participated in continuing education, and stayed out of trouble. Some provided important support for other family members.

Sam Neys has obviously been deprived of the opportunity to show that he appreciates the seriousness of his misconduct and that he can live a law-abiding life. He has been in custody, while others were free. However, Sam has made better use of his time than the facility would allow.

By all appearances, Sam did all he could to improve himself while in custody. He has participated in all of the few programs offered at FDC Dublin and created a few of his own – including a impressive reading list of books he has read since his incarceration. He has a certificate for participating and completing Basic Spanish Class I and for participating and completing AA and NA meetings/classes. However, FDC Dublin would not even allow him (or any inmate) even to take a correspondence course because the staff at FDC Dublin refused to provide the assistance needed for any inmate to do so (e.g., supervise exams). So, on his own, he developed a reading list to educate himself (a copy of the books he has read is attached). Exhibit B.² Indeed, he helped out other inmates not only to read and study, but coordinated Jewish ceremonies – like a Passover Seder – for the few Jewish inmates who were incarcerated so that they could retain some connection to their faith.

² On a recent visit, Sam told counsel that he has more recently read <u>Of Human Bondage</u>, <u>Huckleberry Finn</u>, <u>The Amazing Adventures of Kavalier and Clay</u>, <u>Madea</u>, and <u>The Trojan Women</u>.

In a letter to counsel (and one not edited by counsel), Sam explained some of what he had learned:

Over the past two years, I've rediscovered my obsession with learning everything from history, calculus, the financial markets to languages, religion and spirituality. By living according to religious law, I have instilled discipline and order in my everyday decisions. I will not be depraved [sic] by mundane physical temptations the same way again. The pleasure I derive from learning, which was something I treasured in my youth, alleviates any doubt in what I can do once I dedicate myself. After my release, I plan on finishing [to attend?] a top school receiving a BA in science, biology or chemistry, and then pursuing a career in medicine as the majority of my family on my mother's side have done.

Further, as shown by the letters written by those who know him, he has made a major

mental and emotional commitment to a different life, one not involved in drugs. See PSR, para.

13. Sam is ashamed of his addiction and his behavior under the influence of the drugs that so occupied his mind and time. He feels he has betrayed his family and friends, and has removed himself from being able to assist his grandparents, who have been quite ill and infirm. Even in his intoxicated state, he cared deeply for them and tried to help when his father was not able to do so – shopping for them, taking them to medical appointments, etc.

Indeed, his forced separation from his paternal grandparents – Shaya and Rahel Neys – has been particularly painful. His grandparents came to the United States a few years after Sam and his parents arrived. As his parents worked long hours to support their family, Sam's grandparents were his daily companions – walking him to tennis lesions and to school, his grandfather teaching him the Torah as he readied for his Bar Mitzvah. In many ways, they raised him.

Now in their 80s, they are ill and infirm and have been so for some years. They live in a senior citizen community in San Francisco. When Sam's father, Leonid, moved out of the family home in South San Francisco to San Jose, it fell to Sam to go to San Francisco several times a week to keep them company, buy them groceries, take them to medical appointments, etc. While he was admittedly less conscientious in these duties in the period before his arrest, he has now been denied any contact with them.

Sam's parents told him that they could not bear to tell his grandparents he is in jail for these crimes – they feared it would literally kill them. So, they have been told that Sam is out of the area

studying and working, and thus have explained his absence. He is ashamed they are left alone, without his companionship and that in the final years, he can not comfort them and return the love they so often showed to him. For this he is ashamed.

There is no reason to disbelieve the authors of the many letters submitted to this Court. Considering their observations and Sam's own writings, it is fair to say that if Sam been free of custody over the last 26 months, he would have produced a record of accomplishment that would have equaled that of the other young, codefendants who have come before this Court.

Indeed, almost all of the other defendants have been free on pretrial release in this matter. Sam was unexpectedly ripped from his social fabric and friends, family contacts and the world he knew, however dysfunctional, to a world of bars and locked doors. He had to confront his drug use and misconduct all at once; the other defendants had the luxury of slowing adjusting to their lives under a federal microscope and the prospect of prison.

This Court can thus fairly conclude he has learned a more powerful lesson than they have. He lost his liberty as other young men and women worked, studied, learned and played. Locked behind bars, he has paid a keen price for his youthful addiction and stupidity. He blames no one but himself, but he does understand the high cost of his own actions. As he wrote to counsel in that same letter,

My experience [in custody] has really scared me, and I now understand prison is where I can be spending the rest of my life if I don't change. For the past two years I have been living with the consequences of my actions, in a place I would never have imagined, with the feeling of regret persistently bearing down and reminding me of what I have done. My regret is not because I got caught, but over the shame for what I've done, for how warped and bizarre my concept of achievement had become. I thought a life of excessive drug consumption was some sort of an accomplishment.

He now knows much better.

Further, he has done what he can to "correct" the misconduct of his past, candidly admitting his own misconduct and the misdeeds about which he knew.

In sum, like some of the other codefendants who have received either no prison sentence or a modest prison sentence, Sam Neys has made great progress in his understanding and life since

his arrest and incarceration in July 2005. As counsel believes that the government will not argue that Sam is more culpable than those that supplied the club drugs to him (indeed he was less culpable), then this Court should not sentence him more harshly than those individuals. Because Sam has already served nearly 26 months in prison, no further prison time is warranted.

If this Court concludes that further confinement is warranted, there are ample reasons, consistent with the factors detailed in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), for imposing no more than an aggregate sentence of three (3) years (less credit for time he has already served). The Sentencing Guidelines provide this Court with a point of departure, not a straight-jacket. <u>United States v. Booker</u> and <u>United States v. Fanfan</u>, 543 U.S. 220, 160 L. Ed. 2d 621 (2005). His efforts at rehabilitation, his youth, his limited prior criminal record³, his potential and promise, his acknowledgement of his own misconduct and shame at how his acts have affected him and his family, his effort to correct his misdeeds, all counsel for a sentence well below 63 months, the bottom of the Guideline range calculated in the PSR.

While the Probation Officer "recommended" the bottom of the Guideline range in the PSR, it is clear that she did so without considering the mitigating factors in 18 U.S.C. § 3553a and Sam's cooperation. From her comments, she expected those additional factors would result in a meaningfully lower sentence than the bottom of the Guideline range. And so they should.

Uncounseled misdemeanor convictions may not be used to enhance the sentence of a later conviction. <u>Baldasar v. Illinois</u>, 446 U.S. 222 (1980). . . . An uncounseled misdemeanor conviction cannot be used collaterally to impose an increased prison sentence upon a repeat offender because the lack of counsel undermines the first conviction's reliability.

<u>United States v. Hookano</u>, 957 F.2d 714, 716 (9th Cir. 1992). Accord <u>United States v. Kaneakua</u>, 105 F.3d 463, 467 (9th Cir. 1997).

³ As the PSR notes, Sam's only prior conviction was a misdemeanor theft offense in state court. He did not have counsel at that proceeding. Undersigned counsel examined the court's records and he pled guilty at his first court appearance without counsel. While his criminal history category remains Category I even considering this conviction, the Ninth Circuit has repeatedly held that a defendant's current sentence may not be increased based on a misdemeanor conviction where the defendant did not have counsel.

1	As an alternative to further prison, if this Court is concerned how Sam Neys will conduct			
2	himself if he were released now directly from pretrial detention, even though he will be on			
3	supervised release for an extended period, this Court could order that he be subject to community			
4	confinement for a reasonable period, in addition to the 26 months he has already served in custody			
5	By that means, the Court could further monitor his progress.			
6	If this Court orders an additional prison sentence, counsel requests that this Court			
7	recommend that Sam Neys be allowed to participate in the residential drug treatment program. See			
8	18 U.S.C. § 3621(b) and 28 C.F.R. § 550.56 et seq.			
9	Finally, if this Court sentences Sam Neys to additional time in prison, he requests that this			
10	Court recommend that he be housed in a facility as close to Northern California as possible, as both			
11	his parents, grandparents and friends live in the Bay Area.			
13	In the same letter quoted above to counsel, Sam wrote:			
14	My parents are my main inspiration for starting this new life. At about my age			
15	now, my parents decided to leave the life they knew in the Soviet Union, and start over new in America. They life they left, with all its limitations, was still the only one they had ever known. It took a lot of courage, but they were convinced [that] with hard work and the freedom here to advance they would be successful, living a better, fuller, more gratifying life. I see my future in the same way. I'm leaving my old ways for a land of opportunity. I now for the first time have real goals, and with			
16				
17				
18	all my heart know crime and all that I did before will only hinder me from reaching them.			
19	It does not profit Sam or this community to continue to jail him. He has learned much,			
20	more than most courts could hope that "time in the slammer" could teach a young man. He has not			
21	spent his time idly. He has lost some very precious time, gained some very valuable, if painful,			
22	lessons. Now this Court must decide whether there is any meaningful gain from continuing to jail			
23	him longer than all of his codefendants.			
24	DATED: August 22, 2007 Respectfully submitted			
25	/s/			
26	Scott A. Sugarman			
27	Attorney for Semyon Neys			